	Case 2:07-cv-01679-RSL Docum	nent 19	Filed 03/04/08	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON			
7	AT SEATTLE			
8	JOSEPH ANDREW HYLKEMA,			
9	Plaintiff,	Ca	use No. C07-16	79RSL
10	V.		ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S SECOND MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTERCLAIM	
1112	PALISADES COLLECTION, LLC, et al.,			
13	Defendants.			
14				
15		1	cc; 1	
16	This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's second motion to dismiss			
17	defendants' counterclaim filed under 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(3) for attorney's fees and costs. Defendants contend that plaintiff has brought this action in bad faith and for the purpose			
18	of harassment.			
19	On January 15, 2008, the Court denied plaintiff's first motion to dismiss the			
20	counterclaim for two reasons: (1) it granted defendants' motion to amend and bolster			
21	their counterclaim, and (2) despite plaintiff's contention, the counterclaim is not			
22	premature. Plaintiff now moves again to dismiss the counterclaim because "Defendants"			
23	have failed to amend their answer to cure its deficiencies." Plaintiff's Motion at p. 1.			
24	Plaintiff notes that the Court ordered defendants to file their amended answer, affirmative			
25				
26	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS - 1			

defenses and counterclaim within ten days of the Court's order. Instead, they filed it on February 4, 2008, after plaintiff filed this motion. Defendants have now amended their answer and counterclaim to cure the defects plaintiff alleged. In addition, plaintiff has not shown that he has suffered any prejudice from defendants' very brief delay. Nor has he shown any other justification to warrant the harsh sanction of dismissing the counterclaim. Accordingly, plaintiff's second motion to dismiss (Dkt. #17) is DENIED. Defendants are cautioned, however, that they must comply with all future deadlines in this case. DATED this 4th day of March, 2008. United States District Judge ORDER DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS - 2